

ADELAIDE INSTITUTE

PO Box 3300
Adelaide 5067
Australia
Mob: 61+401692057
Email: info@adelaideinstitute.org
Web: <http://www.adelaideinstitute.org>

Online
ISSN 1440-9828



April 2014 No 754

HATE GROUPS DUMPED FBI unceremoniously jettisons SPLC and ADL as “resources” on hate crimes

By Ronald L. Ray, AFP, April 14, 2014



The FBI quietly dumped the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) and Anti-Defamation League (ADL), two highly prominent purveyors of hatred toward traditional Christian values and white Americans, as “resources” regarding “hate crimes,” according to the FBI’s official website. The move came in response to a stinging complaint sent to Attorney General Eric Holder and FBI Director James Comey from 13 pro-family groups, led by the Family Research Council (FRC).

The organizations made a written request on Feb. 10 for the removal of the SPLC from the government website, as well as an end to FBI-touted partnerships with the leftwing political lobby and other bigoted groups, like the ADL, NAACP and National Organization for Women.

FRC pointed out the intolerable inconsistency of the FBI’s promotion of the SPLC as a reliable public resource for information on “hate crimes,” when the

latter is itself notorious for targeting certain classes of primarily conservative citizens with its venomous outrage and false statistics.

They also noted the federal government’s own conclusion that the “hate map” posted on the SPLC’s website, which lists FRC and similar organizations as “hate groups” because of anti-homosexuality positions, was a contributory factor in a domestic terror attack on FRC offices by a homosexual activist.

This stunning but quiet victory for free speech and moral uprightness first became known on March 26. The Washington Examiner quoted the ADL’s outgoing national director, Abraham Foxman: “We are shocked, surprised and disappointed.”

Indeed. It is one of the very few times that the ADL and SPLC have received a comeuppance from the federal government.

Reported only here, the victory was not a total knockout. An FBI spokesman with whom AFP spoke referred to the FRC for the background of the government's decision, thus confirming the causal connection. But when pressed about whether "partnerships" will continue with the SPLC, ADL and the other racist and sexist organizations mentioned on two distinct FBI "hate crimes" web pages, he backpedaled somewhat on the initial news, suggesting it was unlikely anything was really going to change. The SPLC and ADL did not respond to AFP's requests for comment.

From American free Press
www.americanfreepress.net

*

Obama Should Listen to Harry Barnes Paul Craig Roberts, AFP, 14 April 2014

... Washington is the government that invaded and destroyed Afghanistan and Iraq on the basis of lies. Washington is the government that financed and organized the overthrow of the Libyan and Honduran governments and that is currently attempting to do the same thing to Syria and Venezuela. Washington is the government that attacks with drones and bombs populations in the sovereign countries of Pakistan and Yemen. Washington is the government that has troops all over Africa. Washington is the government that has surrounded Russia, China and Iran with military bases. It is this warmongering collection of Washington war criminals that now asserts that it is standing up for international ideals against Russia.

The position of the government in Washington and its puppet states (Eastern and Western Europe, Great Britain, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Georgia, Japan) and other allies purchased with bagfuls of

money is that Washington's violation of international law by torturing people, by invading sovereign countries on totally false pretenses, by routinely overthrowing democratically elected governments that do not toe the Washington line, is nothing but the "indispensable and exceptional country" bringing "freedom and democracy to the world." But Russia's acceptance of the self-determination of Crimean people to return to their home country is "a violation of international law." ...

*

Special Subscription offer from Willis A. Carto, TBR publisher:

We are so pleased to see that columnist Paul Craig Roberts is aware of the work of historian Harry Elmer Barnes, the man I named my history journal after back in 1994. If you will subscribe to THE BARNES REVIEW magazine for one year at \$46 (U.S. offer) from this ad, I will authorize the staff to send you a free copy of Dr. Barnes's booklet Who Started World War I: An Unbiased Analysis of the Mitigating Factors of World War I. We'll start your subscription out with the first two issues of this year, January/February ("In Defense of Adolf Hitler") and March/April (The Gunpowder Plot: 17th-Century False Flag?"). You'll get four more issues this year—the May/June through November/December issues, as they come off the presses. Order by calling 1-877-773-9077 toll free. Mention you saw the ad in the April 14, 2014 issue [#15] of AFP and I'll also send you a free copy of my booklet on World War II! Note: Each TBR issue is 64 pages of factual, politically incorrect information.

Brandis and Dreyfus take hypocrisy to a new level

PETER VAN ONSELEN, [THE AUSTRALIAN](#), DECEMBER 21, 2013 12:00AM



Illustration: Eric Lobbecke Source: The Australian
ALL you can do is laugh at the hypocritical actions of the first law officer, Attorney-General George Brandis QC, and his opposition counterpart, Mark Dreyfus QC, himself attorney-general in the previous Labor government, when it comes to appointments and the pair's commentary on those appointments.

The two men are no strangers to hypocrisy, having used inflated rhetoric to condemn others for entitlements abuses before themselves being caught out for not dissimilar failings. But the pair's commentary about two recent appointments to the Australian Human Rights Commission reads as if it were torn from the pages of a Yes Minister script.

Last July, Dreyfus appointed 31-year-old Tim Soutphommasane to the AHRC. Brandis slammed the appointment, describing Soutphommasane as an "overt partisan of the Labor Party", adding that "appointees must be people who can command the confidence of the entire community that they will discharge their responsibilities in the human rights field in a non-partisan manner".

Soutphommasane was a member of the Labor Party and an active voice for the Left, appearing regularly on the political talk-show circuit. He was also a fellow at the left-leaning think tank Per Capita. Dreyfus rejected the Brandis attack, arguing Soutphommasane was well qualified for the role. I'll come to that misnomer in a moment. It is worth noting that Soutphommasane was an entry-level academic (albeit a very good one) when he was appointed to a role previously held by judges and former federal ministers.

This week Brandis made his first AHRC appointment, selecting 33-year-old Tim Wilson, a director at the right-wing (it sees itself as "free market") think tank the Institute of Public Affairs.

All of a sudden Brandis no longer thought it important that appointees "discharge their responsibilities in the human rights field in a non-partisan manner", as he had previously said. Equally, having condemned Dreyfus for making the Soutphommasane appointment late in Labor's term without consulting the opposition before doing so, Brandis announced

Wilson's appointment to the AHRC before the Governor-General had even formally signed off on it. Brandis's high bar for due process was suddenly forgotten.

What was Dreyfus's reaction to the Wilson appointment? He said it was "dubious to say the least", attacking Wilson's partisanship (until the appointment Wilson was a member of the Liberal Party). How can Brandis and Dreyfus expect people to take them seriously? By all means condemn a partisan appointment by your political opponents, but don't then make one yourself. By all means make partisan appointments, but for God's sake shut up when your opponents go on to do likewise.

The sad thing about Dreyfus and Brandis is that they are supposed to be the adults in any room: former senior members of the bar and now senior frontbenchers within their parliamentary parties. Prior to Brandis and Dreyfus demeaning themselves, I would have argued that the biggest complaint anyone should have with the Wilson and Soutphommasane appointments is that with a base salary of more than \$320,000 a year, surely candidates should have CVs to match the likes of a Brandis or Dreyfus to even be considered for positions on the AHRC.

In truth, the reason appointees to the commission no longer live up to the pedigree of past commissioners is because the AHRC has been exposed as nothing more than a lobbying arm of the public service, and an expensive one at that. The Fraser government set up the AHRC as an almost quasi-judicial body that would have the power to enforce rulings on issues within its ambit. But a 1995 High Court judgment stripped the commission of the power to make and enforce decisions, turning it into a toothless tiger. Hence the AHRC no longer conducts hearings.

The limited role of the AHRC today is what brings into question the \$25 million it costs each year to run. It isn't just the salaries of the commissioners that are expensive and no longer justifiable. The entire apparatus takes rent-seeking to a new level. You have to love the irony that in the same week that Treasurer Joe Hockey talked about the need to reduce the size of government when releasing his mid-year economic and

fiscal outlook, the Attorney-General makes a new appointment to a body he had previously (privately) canvassed abolishing. It is hard to justify the salaries of commissioners being tied to those of judges, now the role of the AHRC has been downgraded. The calibre of appointments isn't what it once was. There are exceptions: Sex Discrimination Commissioner Elizabeth Broderick, a former law partner, is one. Another is Gillian Triggs, a former dean of law at the University of Sydney. But for the most part finding senior practitioners to fill AHRC roles is increasingly hard to do now the functions of the commission centre around a glorified form of lobbying and public advocacy. And with this shift the likes of Soutphommasane and Wilson become ideally suited to becoming commissioners: able to hit the airwaves to mount arguments in the policy areas they have been assigned.

A lesson for Brandis on the meaning of hypocrisy

PETER VAN ONSELEN CONTRIBUTING EDITOR, [THE AUSTRALIAN](#), DECEMBER 28, 2013 12:00AM

NEW Attorney-General George Brandis clearly doesn't like being called a hypocrite. Come to think of it, who does?

But if the cap fits, sometimes you've just got to wear it, as uncomfortable as that may be.



Cartoon: Eric Lobbecke Source: TheAustralian

Last Saturday in this column I accused Brandis and former Labor attorney-general Mark Dreyfus of hypocrisy over

comments that each made about one another's appointments to the Australian Human Rights Commission.

Brandis recently appointed Tim Wilson - a member of the Liberal Party and well-known right-wing spruiker - despite in July having attacked Labor's appointment of Tim Soutphommasane, a member of the Labor Party and well-known left-wing spruiker. Brandis described Soutphommasane as an "overt partisan of the Labor Party", saying that commissioners must be able to "discharge their responsibilities in the human rights field in a non-partisan manner".

I would have thought it was an open-and-shut case of hypocrisy, but Brandis disagreed, writing to this paper to explain why. His letter was published on Monday.

The argument Brandis mounted to counter my claim that Wilson was a partisan appointment was that while Wilson "may have been a longstanding member of the Liberal Party", "in his contributions to public debate he has been anything but a Liberal Party partisan". The example Brandis used to highlight this point was Wilson's public criticisms of the anti-

bikie laws in Queensland. "We were not looking for a partisan, and we have not appointed one," Brandis boldly declared with the final sentence of his letter.

Brandis's argument had two unintended consequences: first, it highlighted that he actually doesn't understand the definition of a partisan; second, even the incorrect definition Brandis offered up doesn't absolve him of the charge of hypocrisy. In fact, it cements it, as I'll explain.

Brandis is extremely well read. Certainly his library (exposed by this newspaper not that long ago as paid for by the taxpayer, via entitlements) is littered with political and philosophical texts. I have no problem with Brandis expensing his library, incidentally; it is nice to see a politician who surrounds himself with books, a rare sight to be sure. But Brandis, if he reads them, would know full well what being a partisan actually means.

A partisan is someone who supports one side of politics, period. It doesn't mean becoming a drone who can't think for oneself and backs every single element of a party's agenda, and that is not what I was accusing Wilson of being, incidentally (nor Soutphommasane, who is also a partisan, according to the true definition).

A person doesn't cease to be a partisan just because they occasionally (in Wilson's case, very occasionally) disagree with their party's policies. The correct term for someone who never holds views that differ from their political party of choice, no matter what, is a sycophant (although sycophant isn't a formal political-science term in the way that partisan is).

But even if we put to one side Brandis's misuse of what it means to be a partisan and accept his assertion that Wilson is not one, what about the fact Soutphommasane has bucked his party's line on numerous occasions? Why did Brandis see fit to call him an "overt partisan"?

Soutphommasane has challenged Labor over its treatment of boatpeople, its backtracking from support for a big Australia and limits on the humanitarian refugee intake. He even wrote a book titled *Don't Go Back to Where You Came From*, which challenges his former boss Bob Carr's thesis that immigration numbers should be reduced. He has challenged Labor many more times than Wilson has challenged the Liberals.

How can it be that Soutphommasane has done all of that, yet Brandis saw fit to accuse him of being an "overt partisan of the Labor Party", unable to "discharge (his) responsibilities in the human rights field in a non-partisan manner", given the definition of partisanship Brandis wishes to work with? All the more so given that Soutphommasane was appointed to the

position of race discrimination commissioner, thereby putting him in direct conflict with Labor on the issues on which he has disagreed with it previously?

This is in contrast to Wilson, who is in lock-step with the government on the repeal of section 18C of the Racial Discrimination Act, the first significant issue Wilson as a commissioner will be asked to look into.

If Brandis believes Wilson's occasional public disagreements with Liberal Party policy absolve him of the charge of being a partisan, why not Soutphommasane for his many public disagreements with Labor?

The answer is hypocrisy.

Brandis went out of his way in July to describe Soutphommasane as - in effect - a partisan sycophant unable to live up to the needs of the AHRC. Then he invented a new meaning of the word partisan to insulate Wilson (and himself) from the same criticisms he dished out to Soutphommasane and Dreyfus less than six months ago.

As I wrote last week, by all means condemn a partisan appointment by your political opponents, but don't then make one yourself. And by all means make partisan appointments, but for God's sake shut up when your opponents do likewise.

Brandis's letter has invited me to point out a few home truths missed in last weekend's column now that I have revisited this topic. While I charged both Dreyfus and Brandis with hypocrisy last week, clearly the greater hypocrisy was on Brandis's part. His criticisms were far more over the top than Dreyfus's.

Dreyfus (unlike others on the Left) deliberately avoided attacking Wilson for his Liberal Party membership, whereas Soutphommasane's Labor membership was at the heart of Brandis's attacks.

Further, while I believe an AHRC with more balanced representation is a good thing (if it isn't abolished to the tune of a \$25 million saving each year), and Wilson's appointment assists with achieving that, the process Brandis followed ahead of selecting Wilson was appalling.

Not only did he announce the appointment before it was confirmed by the Governor-General, he also chose Wilson without a selection process (which Soutphommasane went through) and without even bothering to inform the president of the AHRC, Gillian Triggs, much less consult her.

Peter van Onselen is a professor at the University of Western Australia.

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/opinion/a-lesson-for-brandis-on-the-meaning-of-hypocrisy/story-e6frg6zo-1226790773623#>

Tim Wilson understands meaning of human rights

GEORGE BRANDIS, [THE AUSTRALIAN](#), DECEMBER 30, 2013 12:00AM

ADMITTEDLY, this is the slowest news week of the year, and perhaps I should be flattered by all the attention, but Peter van Onselen's devotion of two consecutive Saturday columns to the issue of my alleged hypocrisy in appointing Tim Wilson as Australia's next Human Rights Commissioner does seem more than a little obsessional.

Van Onselen's latest tirade in fact amounts to little more than a semantic argument about the meaning of the word "partisan".

I adhere strongly to the view that all members of the Human Rights Commission should act in a non-partisan way; their obligation is to uphold human rights, not the views of a political party. That does not mean that they will not have their own political opinions - it would be hypocrisy indeed to

pretend that those active in the human rights field have an Olympian aloofness from political causes and events.

But just because a person may have belonged to a political party does not make him a partisan, in the sense of being a spokesman or defender of his party's positions.

Tim Wilson was a longstanding member of the Liberal Party, but his principal role in public affairs has been as a policy director of the IPA, Australia's oldest and, in the view of many, most influential political think tank which earlier this year celebrated its 70th anniversary. It is, in a sense, Australia's original human rights organisation, since its *raison d'être* is to defend freedom - the most fundamental of all the human rights.

More often than not, Wilson has taken a position in opposition to that of the Liberal Party. The list is long, but it includes

issues as various as industry assistance, public broadcasting, renewable energy targets, tobacco packaging, industrial relations policy, health insurance, bikie laws and gay marriage, to name but a few.

To describe a person who has been an articulate public opponent of the Liberal Party on so many of the issues which have defined the politics of recent years as a Liberal Party "partisan" seems to me, with all due respect to van Onselen, to be absurd.

The Wilson appointment has produced some surprising reactions. George Williams (a constitutional lawyer associated with the Left) welcomed it, while certain Christian lobby groups (disturbed by Wilson's advocacy of gay marriage) expressed their misgivings.

Even more surprisingly, The Age gave the appointment its cautious editorial endorsement, while The Australian criticised it as an error - an editorial opinion, by the way, at variance with the near to unanimous verdict of this newspaper's letters page. Which goes to show how hard it is to stereotype Wilson's appointment.

But some things never change, like the reaction of the clique of bilious pseudo-intellectuals who constitute what passes for a left-wing commentariat in this country. Mike Carlton, Catherine Deveney, Van Badham and their ilk were nothing if not boorishly predictable.

They and their followers unleashed a storm of hatred and bile against Wilson on social media, the like of which I have never seen. The irony that these people pose as the enemies of "hate speech" was lost on them, if not on others.

More important than the reaction of commentators and social media junkies was the reaction of the professional human rights industry.

While some, including Gillian Triggs, President of the Australian Human Rights Commission, welcomed the appointment, what others had to say was revealing of the task ahead of those of us who are determined to re-centre the human rights debate.

The first Human Rights Commissioner, Brian Burdekin, opined that "the basis of all human rights law is the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights". In a sentence, he captures the error into which modern human rights discourse has fallen: the equation of human rights with human rights law.

Of course, there is a well-developed human rights jurisprudence, based on the interpretation international human rights instruments by various national and international courts. Like any body of law, it seeks to be consistent. But only a narrow lawyer's approach, which regards the interpretation of the corpus of decisions on the meaning of various international human rights instruments as the end of the human rights debate, could produce Burdekin's conclusion that "this is not a matter of competing philosophies".

The human rights debate is precisely a matter of competing philosophies, because fundamental political values are essentially contestable, as anyone with the remotest familiarity with political philosophy understands.

Human rights are not something given to us by governments, let alone by international organisations or by judges. And while the modern jurisprudence of human rights may owe its origin to the 1948 declaration, the declaration is not the source of those rights. Almost two centuries earlier, the founders of the American republic understood better than a whole faculty of human rights lawyers when they wrote the greatest sentence written in English to capture the spirit of the Enlightenment: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

There it all is: that human rights are innate, not vouchsafed by laws; that the greatest of all the rights is to live in freedom and pursue happiness in one's own way; that governments are created by free people to secure their rights, not to decide what their rights shall be.

People who truly care about human rights have always understood that. And nobody understands it better than the new Human Rights Commissioner.

George Brandis is the federal Attorney-General.

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/opinion/tim-wilson-understands-meaning-of-human-rights/story-e6frqd0x-1226791611714#>

Human rights are inalienable and innate

TALKING POINT, THE AUSTRALIAN, DECEMBER 31, 2013 12:00AM

I APPLAUD the cogent and coherent defence by Attorney-General George Brandis of the recent appointment of Tim Wilson as Human Rights Commissioner ("Tim Wilson understands meaning of human rights", 30/12).

The diatribe on this matter from the so-called commentariat who see themselves more as glitterati than literati has been appalling in its imbalance, intemperance and insinuations.

There is much to find dysfunctional regarding the US democratic system but the ideal on which it is predicated - that human rights are inalienable and innate - is unquestionable. Is it too much to ask people to adopt the same standards in their musings as they will undoubtedly require from Wilson?

Warwick Bates, Sanctuary Cove, Qld

I AGREE with Attorney-General George Brandis that human rights are innate to us living in a democratic society rather than privileges doled out by our political masters .

We are indeed fortunate to live in a country with an inherited and healthy common law tradition under which freedoms exist unless unambiguously curtailed by law.

That said, the "inalienable" rights so magnificently guaranteed in the US Constitution and other such instruments must inevitably be judicially interpreted to give substance to what otherwise would be no more than the empty rhetoric common to the constitutions of so many authoritarian regimes.

And it is there that I would part company with Brandis in that I would rather such interpretation was in the hands of an independent Australian judiciary rather than appointed judicial commissioners - whatever their supposed political leanings.

The government might have striven to end such commissions rather than to add to their ranks.

John Kidd, Auchenflower, Qld

GEORGE Brandis is correct to point out that human rights are neither the gift nor the legacy of governments, judges, international organisations or the instruments they produce.

He cites the US Declaration of Independence, acknowledging that all are created equal, with inalienable rights. Yet he trips over his own quote, and ignores the first of all rights - for all humanity - elevating freedom above life itself. There cannot be a right to freedom if there is not first a right to life.

Tim Wilson's tenure will be a success if he maintains human rights in a proper perspective.

Kevin Butler, Barrabool, Vic

I AGREE, George Brandis, some things never change - such as right-wing commentary that descends into name calling such as "the clique of bilious pseudo-intellectuals who constitute what passes for a left-wing commentariat in this country".

Peter van Onselen's writing evokes and debates our understanding of the words partisan and hypocrisy without having to resort to bile. I am sure we can all find heaps of bile in social media. We can also find outstanding online political commentary.

To resort to the argument that human rights are innate is to make Brandis's position clear: let's bury our heads in the sand

and stick to the political opinions and values we were born with, or handed down.

Carole Peters, Shenton Park, WA

TO compare the human rights culture of the US with the human rights culture in Australia, as George Brandis does in justifying his appointment of Tim Wilson to the Human Rights Commission, is comparing apples with pineapples.

The Bill of Rights in the US provides benchmarks for laws. Australia has no bill of rights. Ours is a common law determination of rights, laws made by politicians such as Brandis. They can be laws as capable of violating human rights as implementing them. The legal treatment of asylum-seekers is an example.

Brian Sanaghan, West Preston, Vic

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/opinion/letters/human-rights-are-inalienable-and-innate/story-fn558imw-1226792132773>

THE JERUSALEM POST

Israel's best-selling English daily and most-read English website

MKs say anti-Semitism in Europe could turn violent

Growing figures are 'alarming,' warns Knesset Speaker Edelstein; French immigration to Israel increased 63% over past year.

By SAM SOKOL AND JTA 31/12/2013

Growing European anti-Semitism might become violent, lawmakers attending a session of the Knesset Committee for Immigration, Absorption and Diaspora Affairs stated on Monday. The meeting came as an inverted Nazi salute known as the quenelle, invented and popularized by the anti-Semitic comedian Dieudonne M'bala M'bala, was gaining popularity in France.

Committee chairman MK Yoel Razbozov (Yesh Atid) called on MKs at the hearing to work to "suppress" such manifestations of hate. He also called on the nations of Europe and the European Union to promote tolerance. Without decisive action, he stated, anti-Semitic sentiment "might develop into violent action."

MK Reuven Rivlin (Likud Beytenu) stated that anti-Semitism was "not a danger to the State of Israel," although it was abroad. "Anti-Semitism is dangerous to the world, as it has been shown in the past," Rivlin said. "Therefore, the duty [to combat it] rests primarily on the countries themselves and on leadership in the Christian world."



Growing figures are 'alarming,' warns Knesset Speaker Edelstein; French immigration to Israel increased 63% over past year. Photo by: Marc Israel Sellem/The Jerusalem Post

Use of the quenelle salute has recently soared. Hundreds of quenelle photos can be found on anti-Semitic forums and on Facebook. Others showing it being performed at Jewish sites and Nazi concentration camps have become especially popular.

The gesture has also been used by a soccer star, soldiers guarding a Parisian synagogue and a French national playing in the NBA. While civil servants could face disciplinary action over the quenelle, rank and file French citizens can perform it with impunity.

Anti-Semitism has become a major problem in France, where attacks against Jews have risen significantly since the turn of the millennium due to an influx of Muslim immigrants.

According to a recent study by the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA), 21 percent of French Jews reported experiencing at least one anti-Semitic incident during the past year.

At Monday's committee hearing, Knesset Speaker Yuli Edelstein (Likud) compared anti-Semitism to a stream that, every time one tries to block it, finds another path to "break out."

Citing the FRA report, Edelstein described the figures it presented as "alarming," adding that law enforcement must deal with the problem before it spreads. Violence might "begin with Jews, but it does not end with them," he said.

French immigration to Israel has increased by 63% over the past year, according to new figures released by the Immigration and Absorption Ministry in conjunction with the Jewish Agency for Israel. Things have gotten so bad there that most Jewish parents enroll their children in private schools because of anti-Semitism, a leader of France's Jewish community said last month during an interview.

US Universities of Shame

By [Stephen Lendman](#)

A [previous article](#) discussed the American Studies Association (ASA). It's the nation's oldest and largest organization involved in the interdisciplinary study of US culture and history.

Members include academics, researchers, librarians, and public officials and administrators.

Academic ones represent many disciplines. They include history, literature, religion, art, architecture, philosophy, music, science, ethnic studies, anthropology, sociology, political science, education, and gender studies among others. On December 16, ACA members voted to boycott Israeli academic institutions. They did so justifiably. They did so overwhelmingly.

Their December 4 resolution supported social justice. It opposed "all forms of racism, including anti-semitism, discrimination, and xenophobia..."

It stood in "solidarity with aggrieved peoples" everywhere. It did so righteously. It did it honorably. It did the right thing. It did it because it matters.

It said America "plays a significant role in enabling" Israel's occupation, its "illegal settlements and (its) Wall in violation of international law..."

It supports "systematic discrimination against Palestinians." It's had a "devastating impact on (their) well-being..." Their fundamental rights are denied.

Palestinian academic freedom is denied. ASA "is dedicated to the rights of students and scholars to pursue education and research without undue state interference, repression, and military violence" everywhere.

It "resolved (to) honor the call of Palestinian civil society for a boycott of Israeli academic institutions."

It's justified, it said, for the following reasons:

*US military and other support for Israel;

*Israel's systematic violation of international laws and UN resolutions;

*the harsh impact of its longstanding occupation;

*"the extent to which Israeli institutions of higher education are a party to state policies that violate human rights," and

*strong ASA member support.

Their resolution is binding until Israel stops violating human and civil rights, as well as international law. It doesn't apply to Israeli scholars. ASA supports their academic and related rights.

In response to ASA's boycott, four US universities cancelled their memberships. They include Brandeis, Penn State, University of Indiana, and Kenyon College.

[Indiana University](#) president Michael McRobbie affirmed his support for wrong over right. He did so disgracefully. He issued a statement, saying:

"Indiana University joins other leading research universities in condemning in the strongest possible terms the boycott of institutions of higher education in Israel as proposed by the American Studies Association and other organizations."

"Boycotts such as these have a profound chilling effect on academic freedom, and universities must be clear and unequivocal in rejecting them."

"Indiana University strongly endorses the recent statement on this matter by the Association of American Universities and the long-standing position in this area of the American Association of University Professors."

"Indiana University values its academic relationships with colleagues and institutions around the world, including many important ones with institutions in Israel, and will not allow political considerations such as those behind this ill-conceived boycott to weaken those relationships or undermine the principle of academic freedom in this way."

"IU stands firmly against proposals that would attempt to limit or restrict those important institutional relationships or this fundamental principle."

"Indiana University will contact the ASA immediately to withdraw as an institutional member. We urge the leadership

of the ASA and other associations supporting the boycott to rescind this dangerous and ill-conceived action as a matter of urgency."

Other US universities issued statements opposing ASA's boycott. Doing so supports Israel's worst crimes. It's done reprehensibly.

Culpable schools include Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Brown, Cornell, the University of Chicago, Northwestern, University of Maryland, University of Indiana, Wesleyan University, and New York University.

It bears repeating. Opposing ASA's courageous stand endorses Israel's worst crimes. It supports occupation harshness. It supports militarism writ large.

It opposes Palestinian liberation. It's against their right to live free on their own land in their own country.

It supports longstanding Israeli crimes of war, against humanity, and slow-motion genocide. It shames their academic reputation in the process. It destroys their credibility.

It gives pause to what they teach in classrooms. Supporting wrong over right has no place in academia. It has no place anywhere. It demands unflinching opposition.

[Harvard](#)'s Drew Gilpin Faust said the following:

"Academic boycotts subvert the academic freedoms and values necessary to the free flow of ideas, which is the lifeblood of the worldwide community of scholars."

"The recent resolution of the ASA proposing to boycott Israeli universities represents a direct threat to these ideals, ideals which universities and scholarly associations should be dedicated to defend."

[University of Maryland](#) president Wallace Loh and senior vice president/provost Mary Ann Rankin issued the following joint statement:

"We firmly oppose the call by some academic associations – American Studies Association; Asian-American Studies Association – to boycott Israeli academic institutions."

"Any such boycott is a breach of the principle of academic freedom that undergirds the University of Maryland and, indeed, all of American higher education."

"Faculty, students, and staff on our campus must remain free to study, do research, and participate in meetings with colleagues from around the globe."

"The University of Maryland has longstanding relationships with several Israeli universities. We have many exchanges of scholars and students. We will continue and deepen these relationships."

"In the United States, we can disagree with the governmental policies of a nation without sanctioning the universities of that nation, or the American universities that collaborate with them."

"To restrict the free flow of people and ideas with some universities because of their national identity is unwise, unnecessary, and irreconcilable with our core academic values."

[Wesleyan University](#) president Michael Roth called ASA's boycott "a repugnant attack on academic freedom, declaring academic institutions off-limits because of their national affiliation."

He "deplore(s)" what he calls ASA's "politically retrograde resolution...Under the guise of phony progressivism, the group has initiated an irresponsible attack on academic freedom. Others in academia should reject this call for an academic boycott."

Roth ignores important facts.

The Alternative Information Center (AIC) explained. It published a [report titled](#) "Academic Boycott of Israel and the Complicity of Academic Institutions in Occupation of Palestinian Territories."

Numerous Israeli universities have long disturbing histories. They support colonization, occupation and apartheid.

They turn a blind eye to Israeli crimes of war and against humanity. They include:

- *Tel Aviv University;
- *Bar-Ilan University;
- *Hebrew University;
- *Haifa University;
- *the Weizman Institute;
- *Peres Academic Center;
- *Technion;
- *the Herzliya Interdisciplinary Center;
- *Haddasah College;
- *Judea and Samaria College for Engineering;
- *Jordan Valley College; and
- *Holon College among others.

Nearly all Israeli academic institutions give IDF soldiers academic benefits. Doing so increases in times of war. It shows support for lawless aggression.

At the same time, many Israeli academics oppose their government's policies. They do it in writing. They do so publicly. They courageously support right over wrong. They risk their careers doing it.

Israeli Arab citizens comprise over 20% of Israel's population. Less than 10% have BA degrees. Less than 5% have master's degrees. Around 3% hold doctorates.

Only about 1% of Israeli institutions of higher learning are Palestinians. Israeli colleges and universities reject three times as many Arab applicants as Jewish ones.

Blatant discrimination is policy. Hebrew and Arabic are official Israeli languages. No major Israeli academic institution offers courses conducted in Arabic.

Palestinians not registered as students are treated differently from Jews. Hebrew University requires police-issued character references to visit its campus. It's to ensure they're not "terrorists."

Hebrew University, Tel Aviv University and others have separate campuses in Occupied Palestine. They're situated on stolen Palestinian land.

High ranking military and security officials hold positions in Israeli universities. Doing so legitimizes their crimes of war and against humanity.

Academic freedom is a universal principle. Not in Israel. Political dissent is discouraged. It's stifled. Anti-government activism risks trouble.

Students face disciplinary action. Academics are shunned by their colleagues. Some risk dismissal. Israeli academic freedom is more illusion than reality.

The campaign against South African apartheid included academic boycotts. Numerous well-known organizations supported it.

It was harsher than the global BDS campaign. It virtually spurned South African colleges and universities altogether. It did so for their complicity with apartheid. It was a model for future boycotts.

Israel is more vulnerable economically than South Africa. BDS and supportive boycotts are politically and psychologically damaging.

They build on their own momentum. Their pressure is effective. Doing the right thing is more than its own reward. When sustained, it gets results.

BDS is stronger and more effective than ever. Omar Barghouti co-founded the Palestinian Campaign for the Academic and Cultural Boycott of Israel (PACBI).

On December 13, he [headlined](#) "On Academic Freedom and the BDS Movement," saying:

ASA's "academic boycott of Israel provides fresh evidence that (BDS) may be reaching a tipping point on college campuses and academic associations."

Israel "treat(s) (it) as a 'strategic' threat." John Kerry called it an "existential threat" to Israel.

BDS "represents the overwhelming majority of Palestinian society," said Barghouti. It "seeks to realize basic Palestinian rights under international law."

It does so by "applying effective, global, morally consistent pressure on Israel and all the institutions that collude in its violations of international law..."

Judith Butler is a UC Berkeley philosopher. She co-directs its Program of Critical Theory. She calls BDS:

"the most important contemporary alliance calling for an end to forms of citizenship based on racial stratification, insisting on rights of political self-determination for those for whom such basic freedoms are denied or indefinitely suspended, insisting as well on substantial ways of redressing the rights of those forcibly and/or illegally dispossessed of property and land."

Supporting it is a universal imperative. ASA supports justice. It's not alone. In April, the Association for Asian-American Studies endorsed an academic boycott.

It was the first US academic association to do so. It won't likely be the last. Justifiable initiatives have legs. They attract growing numbers of followers.

Sunshine is the best disinfectant. Truth drowns out misguided illusions. Spreading it is essential. Influential voices do it best. The Teachers' Union of Ireland unanimously called for "ceasing all cultural and academic collaboration (with the) apartheid state of Israel."

The French-Speaking Belgian Students (FEF) represents 100,000 members. It adopted "a freeze of all academic partnerships with Israeli academic institutions."

UC Berkeley and other North American universities called for divesting from Israeli companies. Those profiteering from occupation were targeted.

Calls for boycotting Israel are increasing. Legal scholar Noura Erakat says doing so represents "an ethic of legitimate dissent."

Francis Boyle supports BDS based on the South African anti-apartheid model. So do many other distinguished academics and public figures.

It's no longer taboo to do so. It's a vital imperative. It's important to urge others to do it. It's essential to hold Israel accountable.

BDS has nothing to do with compromising academic freedom. It has everything to do with demanding long denied justice.

Barghouti calls boycotting Israeli academic institutions vital. They're complicit "in planning, implementing, justifying or whitewashing aspects of Israel's occupation, racial discrimination and denial of refugee rights."

Collusion takes many forms. Doing so spurns Palestinian rights. Zionism harms Jews and Arabs alike. It's the enemy of peace, equity and justice.

The UN Committee on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (UNESCR) calls academic freedom:

- *"the liberty of individuals to express freely opinions about the institution or system in which they work,
- *to fulfill their functions without discrimination or fear of repression by the state or any other actor,
- *to participate in professional or representative academic bodies, and

- *to enjoy all the internationally recognized human rights applicable to other individuals in the same jurisdiction."

The 1993 World Conference on Human Rights said:
"All human rights are universal, indivisible, interdependent and interrelated."

"The international community must treat human rights globally in a fair and equal manner, on the same footing, and with the same emphasis."

Academic freedom requires letting all views be aired freely. It obligates institutions of higher learning to do so.

Peace, equity and justice requires holding Israel accountable. Ignoring its crimes of war and against humanity no longer is acceptable.

Academic institutions and others need to be in the forefront for justice. Failure to do so destroys their credibility.

A Final Comment

On December 27, Francis Boyle wrote Harvard president Faust. He responded to her opposition to ASA's academic boycott. He wrote as follows:

Dear President Faust:

"I notice your condemnation of the ASA Boycott against Israel in today's New York Times."

"I note for the record that Harvard has never once apologized to those of us Harvard Alums who participated in good faith in the Harvard Divestment/Disinvestment Campaign against Israel when your predecessor Larry Summers accused us of being anti-Semitic – a charge which he refused to defend against me as related below."

"As a matter of fact, Harvard is so notoriously anti-Palestinian that the late, great Edward Said refused to accept Harvard's top chair in Comparative Literature when Harvard offered it to him."

"As a loyal Harvard alum I spent an entire evening with Edward at a Chinese Restaurant in Manhattan trying to convince Edward to take this Chair."

"I thought it would be good for Harvard to have Edward teaching there. As a lawyer and a law professor, I can be quite persuasive."

"But Edward would have none of my arguments. As Edward saw it, Harvard was so anti-Palestinian that Harvard would have thwarted his intellectual creativity to move there."

"So Edward stayed at Columbia. Of course Edward was right. And the anti-Palestinian tenor and orientation of Harvard has certainly gotten far worse since when Edward and I were both students at Harvard."

"Harvard should be doing something about its own longstanding bigotry and racism against the Palestinians. Not criticizing those of us trying to help the Palestinians suffering

from Israeli persecution, war crimes, crimes against humanity, and outright genocide."

Yours very truly,

Francis A. Boyle

Professor of Law

Harvard isn't alone among major US academic institutions. Support for Israel's worst crimes is widespread. So is spurning fundamental Palestinian rights.

International law affirms them. It high time discriminatory US academic institutions did so. Nothing less is acceptable! Not now! Not ever!

About the Author: Stephen Lendman lives in Chicago. He can be reached at lendmanstephen@sbcglobal.net. He writes for MoneyNewsNow.com and VeteransToday.com. He is also author of the celebrated books "[Banker Occupation: Waging Financial War on Humanity](#)" and "[How Wall Street Fleeces America: Privatized Banking, Government Collusion and Class War](#)".

Lendman also hosts his own blog at silendman.blogspot.com.

He is host of a progressive radio show with cutting-edge discussions and distinguished guests on the [Progressive Radio News Hour on the Progressive Radio Network](#). It airs Fridays at 10AM US Central time and Saturdays and Sundays at noon. All programs are archived for easy listening. It airs Fridays at 10AM US Central time and Saturdays and Sundays at noon. All programs are archived for easy listening.

<http://www.veteranstoday.com/2013/12/30/us-universities-of-shame/>

A century of deceit:

Iraq, the World Wars, Holocaust Mythology and Zionist Militarism

Brandon Martinez looks at the Zionist project and all of its murderous and destructive consequences

Thursday April 3, 2014 7:49AM GMT



A Century of Deceit: Iraq, the World Wars, Holocaust Mythology and Zionist Militarism

Some studies estimate that close to 1.5 million Iraqis have lost their lives as a result of the brutal American invasion and occupation of their country in 2003.^[1] Millions more Iraqis have become refugees and orphans with no future prospects for prosperity, sanctity or stability. Most of the critical infrastructure of the country was bombed into rubble and dust. American depleted uranium weapons have caused cancer rates in some Iraqi cities to skyrocket, permanently destroying the genes of future generations of Iraqis who are being born with horrific birth defects and diseases.

The culprits responsible for this genocidal campaign to subdue and enslave the Iraqi people are not the CEOs of American oil companies as some disingenuous commentators on the Left have claimed. President George W. Bush's foreign policy in the

Middle East was not his own nor that of the oil lobby, but was the brainchild of the neoconservative conspirators behind the Project for the New American Century (PNAC), the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs (JINSA), the American Enterprise Institute (AEI) and other Zionist-oriented think tanks that dominated the Washington Beltway.

Three of Bush's principal foreign policy advisors who are widely recognized as the prime movers behind the war in Iraq were neocon ideologues Richard Perle, Douglas Feith and Paul Wolfowitz, all of whom have well-documented histories of Israeli partisanship. Perle and Wolfowitz, for instance, were both investigated by the FBI in the 1980s for passing classified defence documents to Israel.^[2] Perle was once an employee of the Israeli weapons firm Soltam.^[3] Writers for the *New York Times* described Wolfowitz as one of Israel's "staunchest allies" in the Bush administration and revealed that Wolfowitz "is friendly with Israel's generals and diplomats" and that he is "something of a hero to the heavily Jewish neoconservative movement."^{[4][5]} Feith once ran a law firm in Israel and received an award from the Zionist Organization of America for his "services to Israel and the Jewish people."^[6] The *New Yorker* revealed that Feith even has a portrait of Zionism's founder Theodore Herzl hanging on the wall of his home library.^[7] It was Feith and his neocon Zionist colleague Abram Shulsky who oversaw the secretive "Office of Special Plans" in the Pentagon where all of the lies about Iraq's "weapons of mass destruction" were conceived and disseminated.^[8]

These Israeli militarists, masquerading as American thinkers, left behind a paper trail that unveiled their true objectives. In 1996, Richard Perle, Douglas Feith and David Wurmser — all future Bush administration officials — authored a strategy paper for Benjamin Netanyahu's Israeli Likud regime entitled "A Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm."^[9] In the paper, these Zionist hawks advocated an

aggressive Israeli foreign policy, calling for the removal of all of Israel's possible military competitors in the region through force. They spoke of "weakening, containing, and even rolling back Syria" and of removing Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq, calling it an "important Israeli strategic objective." Also on their hit list was Iran, whose influence in the region they hoped to neutralize as well. By eliminating Israel's external enemies the Zionist neocons were in turn endeavoring to subdue Israel's internal foes, the indigenous Arab Palestinians who continue to resist Israeli occupation and apartheid.[\[10\]](#)

Meyrav Wurmser, the wife of neocon David Wurmser, confessed that most of the leading neocons are pro-Israel Jews.[\[11\]](#) Gal Beckerman, a writer for the Jewish *Forward* newspaper, admitted that the ideology of neoconservatism itself was the brainchild of chauvinistic Jewish intellectuals such as Leo Strauss, Irving Kristol and Albert Wohlstetter. "If there is an intellectual movement in America to whose invention Jews can lay sole claim, neoconservatism is it," Beckerman wrote.[\[12\]](#) Prominent Israeli journalist Ari Shavit said the Iraq war was engineered by a cabal of 25 mostly Jewish neoconservative intellectuals.[\[13\]](#) Famed American-Jewish journalist Carl Bernstein expressed the same view on MSNBC. The Iraq war was launched on a phony pretext by Bush, Cheney and "the Jewish neocons who wanted to remake the world," Bernstein opined, much to the chagrin of the pro-Zionist host.[\[14\]](#)

The engine driving the Zionist-led neoconservative war machine is "holocaust" mythology. "For those of us who are involved in foreign and defense policy today of my generation," explained Richard Perle in a BBC interview, "the defining moment of our history was certainly the holocaust."[\[15\]](#) Douglas Feith often invokes the holocaust to justify his militarism. In a *New Yorker* profile, Feith asked, "What's the answer to the Holocaust?" He answered his own question by suggesting that it is not surprising that this alleged event has caused so many Jews to become militant neocons dedicated to aggressive, unyielding warfare against all those who pose a "threat" to Jews and their interests.[\[16\]](#) In a *New York Times* profile, Paul Wolfowitz spoke of the holocaust as having a profound impact on his worldview.[\[17\]](#) Another neocon ringleader, Michael Ledeen, revealed his obsession with the subject in an article he authored entitled "The New Holocaust."[\[18\]](#) Political analyst Kevin Barrett observed that the Israelis and their Jewish neocon patrons in Washington "are fanatical extremists who feel that they are being persecuted everywhere they go and that they have to be extremely harsh, unyielding and aggressive, as well as deceptive and violent with the world" in order to ensure their survival.[\[19\]](#) Somehow it doesn't dawn on them that maybe it is their unscrupulous behaviour that is the cause of hostility towards them in the first place. Obviously introspection is not exactly a Zionist virtue.

The Zionists' militarist mindset is evidently motivated by the ethnocentric myths of Jewish victimhood. World-conquering Neocon-Zionist belligerence is driven in large part by the religious adherence to the official propaganda of the victors of World War II. Elite Jews played an important role in bringing about the Second World War as the final phase of their plan to establish the state of Israel. The First World War accomplished several things for the Zionists: it freed up Palestine from Ottoman control (the Ottomans previously rejected Zionist offers to purchase Palestine), it fractured the big empires of Europe who could then be manipulated into future conflicts, and lastly it delivered Russia to the Bolsheviks, a majority of whom were Jewish chauvinists hell-bent on the subjugation of that Christian Empire. With Russia now in the hands of Jewish communist extremists and Palestine falling under British dominion, the Zionist plan for Israel was well on its way.

"It has been repeatedly acknowledged by British Statesmen," wrote Zionist leader Chaim Weizmann in a 1941 letter to British leader Winston Churchill, "that it was the Jews who, in the last [world] war, effectively helped to tip the scales in America in favour of Great Britain. They are keen to do it - and may do it - again." Weizmann went on to ask for British

assistance in the formation of a "Jewish fighting force" that would be used to ethnically cleanse Palestine of its Arab population. Weizmann promised Churchill that if the British would help create a Jewish militia to conquer Palestine, he would do his utmost to mobilize American Jewry to exert their influence to draw America into the Second World War on Britain's side, as they did in the first great war.[\[20\]](#)

Benjamin Freedman, a former top-level Zionist, exposed the machinations of his brethren relating to the First and Second World Wars and the Zionist conquest of Palestine. In a 1961 speech at the Willard Hotel in Washington, D.C., Freedman explained that the United States was "suckered into the [first world] war merely so that the Zionists of the world could obtain Palestine." Freedman described how Zionist Jews made a secretive deal with the British leadership during World War I promising to bring America into the war in exchange for Palestine. The result of this agreement was the "Balfour Declaration" of 1917, a British government decree that promised to make Palestine into a national homeland for the Jews.[\[21\]](#) Freedman stressed the absurdity that Britain "should offer [Palestine] as coin of the realm to pay the Zionists for bringing the United States into the war." The Zionists, said Freedman, "have complete control of our government. ... The Zionists and their co-religionists rule this United States as though they were the absolute monarchs of this country."[\[22\]](#)

In a December 1919 speech in Jerusalem, Chaim Weizmann boasted about securing the Balfour Declaration from the British government through "persistent propaganda, through unceasing demonstration of the life force of our people." "We told the responsible authorities: We will establish ourselves in Palestine whether you like it or not," Weizmann said. "You can hasten our arrival or you can equally retard it. It is however better for you to help us so as to avoid our constructive powers being turned into a destructive power which will overthrow the world."[\[23\]](#) Threatening the world into approving the creation of Israel was part and parcel of the Zionist project from its inception.

In 1903 an early Zionist leader named Max Nordau conspicuously predicted the outbreak of the First World War, which lends credence to the suggestion that a hidden force of Jewish Zionists, Freemasons and bankers are responsible for instigating the conflict for their own purposes. "Let me tell you the following words as if I were showing you the rungs of a ladder leading upward and upward: Herzl, the Zionist Congress, the English Uganda proposition, the future world war, the peace conference - where with the help of England a free and Jewish Palestine will be created," Nordau told his compatriots at the sixth Zionist Congress in Basel, Switzerland, 11 years before the outbreak of the First World War and 14 years before the British issued the "Balfour Declaration."[\[24\]](#)

Such predictive powers unveil a plan that was consciously followed and executed during and after World War I. The "peace conference" Nordau envisioned was the 1919 Paris Peace Conference, which resulted in the Treaty of Versailles, a farce that unjustly punished Germany for a war it did not start, thus laying the groundwork for the inevitable outbreak of the Second World War. An international peacekeeping body was established shortly after World War I known as the League of Nations. The League put its stamp of approval on the British seizure of Palestine after the war, an imperial land-grab that had no real legitimacy outside of the self-serving declarations of the political elites, bankers and oligarchs who chaired the League.

The League essentially functioned as a tool of the financial elite and served the geopolitical aspirations of the Zionists. "The League of Nations is a Jewish idea, and Jerusalem some day will become the capital of the world's peace," proclaimed Jewish leader Nahum Sokolow at a Zionist conference in Carlsbad, California, in 1922. "The League has recognized our rights to our ancient home," he said. "We Jews throughout the world will make the League's struggle our own and will not rest until there is ultimate victory."[\[25\]](#)

Even with Palestine now in the palm of their hands, the Zionists still had a problem: convincing Europe's Jews to leave their lives of luxury and embrace Palestine as their new home. Such a task proved difficult, with only a minority of European Jews strongly identifying with Zionism at this time. This reality sheds a different light on the rise of Adolf Hitler and National Socialism in Germany, which proved very convenient from the Zionists' perspective. While publicly professing scorn and hatred of Nazism, Zionist Jews secretly initiated a deal with Hitler's government – the "Transfer Agreement" – which saw the transfer of tens of thousands of German Jews and their assets to Palestine. Lasting from 1933 through 1941, the Nazi-Zionist pact proved crucial to the future establishment of the Zionist state. The large amounts of capital and agricultural equipment that was shipped into Palestine by way of this agreement substantially contributed to the creation of Israel.

"Through this pact, Hitler's Third Reich did more than any other government during the 1930s to support Jewish development in Palestine," opined historian Mark Weber in his article titled "Zionism and the Third Reich." "[D]uring the 1930s no nation did more to substantively further Jewish-Zionist goals than Hitler's Germany," says Weber.^[26]

Still, the Transfer Agreement alone did not produce the amount of Jewish emigration necessary to form an exclusivist Jewish ethno-state in Palestine, as the Zionists intended all along. There simply were not enough Jews in Palestine that would be required to replace the expelled Arabs and keep them at bay. Not only that, but there was still not enough global support or sympathy for the creation of a state for Jews. Since the dawn of Zionism in the late 1800s, Jewish-Zionist ideologues had been ravenously promoting the story of "six million" persecuted and oppressed Jews. "We Jews need a homeland of our own because we are persecuted wherever we go" was the traditional Zionist argumentation. But the First World War did not produce the circumstances needed to foist this propaganda on the world. Jews were not singled out for persecution or mistreatment by any belligerent in that war, which is why the Zionists, following the dictates of their founder Theodore Herzl, deliberately aided and abetted Hitler's forces to corral their fellow Jews into ghettos and concentration camps during the Second World War.

Herzl, in his diaries, advocated making use of "anti-Semitism" to spur Jewish emigration to Palestine. "It would be an excellent idea to call in respectable, accredited anti-Semites as liquidators of [Jewish] property," he wrote. "The anti-Semites will become our most dependable friends, the anti-Semitic countries our allies. ... I have already told you that we want to let respectable anti-Semites participate in our project, respecting their independence which is valuable to us—as a sort of people's control authority."^[27] Did Hitler not carry out Herzl's exact mandate? It must be pointed out that Hitler's "final solution of the Jewish question" was the same procedure outlined by Zionists decades earlier: sequestering all Jews into a single state, isolated from other nations. "The final solution of the Jewish question lies therefore in the establishment of the Jewish State," said the 1897 manifesto of a German-Zionist group.^[28] In an 1899 letter, Theodore Herzl asked the Russian Czar if he would hear out his "Zionist plan for the final solution of the Jewish Question."^[29] In 1936, the Jewish nationalist leader Vladimir Jabotinsky laid out what the Zionist plan would ultimately entail: "It is not our task to establish in Palestine a home for selected people, not even a state for a small portion of our people. The aim of our efforts is to organize a systematic massive Jewish evacuation from all the countries in which they live."^[30]

"The transfer of millions of Jews to their homeland [Palestine] will save the European Jewry from extermination," declared Jabotinsky in 1940, adding, "Evacuation of the Jewish masses is the only cure for the Jewish catastrophe."^[31] The "extermination" Jabotinsky spoke of was not happening, but that didn't stop Zionist propagandists from disseminating reckless atrocity stories of systematic genocide in order to win the world over to the Zionist cause. Legends of human soap, skin lampshades, shrunken heads, electric shock chambers,

gas chambers and other absurdities were trumpeted from the rooftops by Zionists and their controlled press.

Jewish leaders made numerous public pronouncements designed to provoke Hitler, hoping he would unleash his fury upon Europe's Jews, and with the help of Organized Zionism spur them to make their way to Palestine. For instance, Organized Jewry made a declaration of war against Germany in March 1933, before Hitler took any serious measures restricting the rights of German Jews. "Judea Declares War on Germany: Jews of All the World Unite in Action," read the headline of the March 24, 1933, edition of Britain's *Daily Express*. The corresponding article declared a Jewish "holy war against Germany." "The Israeli people around the world," the article continued, "declare economic and financial war against Germany. Fourteen million Jews stand together as one man, to declare war against Germany."^[32] A year later Jabotinsky made a similarly bellicose pronouncement, stating:

"For months now the struggle against Germany is waged by each Jewish community, at each conference, in all our syndicates, and by each Jew all over the world. There is reason to believe that our part in this struggle has general value. We will trigger a spiritual and material war of all the world against Germany's ambitions to become once again a great nation, to recover lost territories and colonies. But our Jewish interests demand the complete destruction of Germany."^[33]

As the war drew near, Chaim Weizmann did everything in his power to invite definite reprisals against Jews from Hitler's regime. In a 1939 letter to British leader Neville Chamberlain, Weizmann declared that "the Jews stand by Great Britain and will fight on the side of the democracies."^[34] Weizmann and his Zionist colleagues made many public statements to that effect, which Hitler referenced in a July 1942 speech.^[35] In 1941, an American Jew named Theodore Kaufman made an even more brazen effort to deliberately provoke hostility towards Jews. He authored and published a book advocating the genocide of the whole German people by way of a forced sterilization program. Kaufman's text, titled *Germany Must Perish!*, outlined "a comprehensive plan for the extinction of the German nation and the total eradication from the earth, of all her people."^[36] A map illustrating the possible territorial break-up of Germany and the "apportionment of her lands" was also found in the book. "Germany must perish forever from this earth!" Kaufman declared, calling for "a final solution" of German extinction. Hitler's propaganda chief Joseph Goebbels was well aware of Kaufman's hateful screed, and widely distributed it in Germany to bolster his case of a Jewish conspiracy against his country.

Zionist leaders and activists gave Hitler more than enough ammunition to justify interning Jews in camps as a security threat to Germany. The American and Canadian governments imprisoned Japanese, German and Italian citizens in camps during the war with a far weaker rationale. Japanese, German and Italian citizens of the US and Canada had not declared a "holy war" against their adopted countries, but were interned nonetheless. It is difficult to escape the conclusion that these Zionist provocations were a cleverly calculated ruse intended to create an atmosphere in Europe conducive to the Zionist transfer plan. Without the uprooting process initiated by the National Socialists and their Zionist assistants, it is unlikely that any large amount of European Jews would have voluntarily left Europe for an uncertain future in Palestine.

Some Jewish casualties in a devastating war that took tens of millions of lives was inevitable and very much desired by the Zionist leaders seeking a pretext to invade and conquer Palestine for Jewish colonization. "There are 6,000,000 living, bleeding, suffering arguments in favor of Zionism," declared Rabbi Stephen S. Wise at a meeting of Zionists in New York in 1900.^[37] In 1906, a German-Jewish philanthropist named Dr. Paul Nathan publicized the notion that the Russian government had initiated a policy of exterminating its Jews as a "solution" to the "Jewish question" and that six million were in grave danger.^[38] Max Nordau, the Zionist leader who predicted World War I, invoked the story of six million persecuted Jews

in 1899, 1911 and 1920.^[39] At a Zionist conference in 1911, Nordau warned that it was only a matter of time before six million Jews would be “annihilated” by European governments.^[40]

This familiar narrative was repeatedly advanced a few dozen times before, during and after World War I.^[41] A most interesting example is from October 1919 when the *American Hebrew* publication carried an alarmist story headlined “The Crucifixion of Jews Must Stop” which alleged that “six million Jewish men and women” were on the brink of a “holocaust of human life.”^[42] A *New York Times* report from the same year headlined “Ukrainian Jews Aim To Stop Pogroms” alleged that six million Jews in the Ukraine and Poland were being targeted in pogroms and massacres.^[43] Another report from 1921 titled “Begs America Save 6,000,000 In Russia,” also from the *New York Times*, said, “Russia’s 6,000,000 Jews are facing extermination by massacre.”^[44]

As the Second World War approached, Zionists amplified their atrocity propaganda. In 1936, Chaim Weizmann told a British Commission that “six million Jews” in Europe had “neither hope nor future save in the land of Israel.”^[45] In 1940, World Jewish Congress chairman Nahum Goldmann proclaimed that if the German National Socialists achieved victory in the war “6,000,000 Jews in Europe are doomed to destruction.”^[46] Amazingly, Zionist newspapers betrayed the pre-meditated and fraudulent nature of the six million myth by proclaiming precisely six million Jewish victims six months *before* the end of the war.^[47] Soviet-Jewish war propagandist Ilya Ehrenburg told his readers that “the world now knows that Germany has killed six million Jews” in March of 1945, two months before the end of hostilities and long before any accurate statistical data of war casualties would become available.^[48] “At that time, no demographic figures could have been available to [Ehrenburg],” writes German Rudolf in the preface of *The First Holocaust*. “Just a year later,” Rudolf continues, “British Historian David Irving emphasized that as early as June 1945, in other words immediately after the end of hostilities in Europe, some Zionist leaders claimed to be able to provide the precise number of Jewish victims – six million, of course – even though the chaos reigning in Europe at that time rendered any demographic studies impossible.”^[49]

In an effort to whitewash their own egregious war crimes, the Allied Powers went along with the Zionists’ pre-meditated fictional account of six million dead Jews. At the post-war Nuremberg trials, an Allied-run kangaroo court staffed to the brim by Zionist Jews and their Allied lackeys, the truth was buried underneath a tidal wave of falsehoods. The Zionist motives for the war itself were purposefully obscured and a cartoonish propaganda narrative of “Nazi evil” was foisted upon the world to advance the victors’ post-war aims for Europe and accelerate the Zionists’ ambitions for a Jewish ethno-state in Palestine. American Senator Thomas Dodd, who was a chief prosecutor at the Nuremberg trials in 1945, revealed in a letter to his wife that the staff at Nuremberg was about 75 per cent Jewish. “Now my point is that the Jews should stay away from this trial — for their own sake,” Dodd wrote in the letter, adding, “For ... the charge ‘a war for the Jews’ is still being made and in the post-war years it will be made again and again. The too large percentage of Jewish men and women here [at Nuremberg] will be cited as proof of this charge.”^[50]

When the Soviet Union and its communist satellites in Eastern Europe collapsed in 1991, so did the myth of the six million. The Soviet lie of four million deaths at Auschwitz – a monstrous exaggeration accepted as ‘fact’ for decades – was officially reduced to around one million, but revisionist historians doubt even that figure. Revisionist scholarship has determined that somewhere between 100-150 thousand people perished in Auschwitz mainly as a result of disease and starvation, which was not a deliberate act on the part of the Germans but rather the outcome of Allied carpet-bombing of Germany’s infrastructure.^[51] For years Zionist propagandists claimed several million Jews had been killed by the Germans

at the Mauthausen and Majdanek concentration camps, but recent official revisions place the Jewish death totals there at 74,000 combined.^[52] Despite the vast lowering of the death figures at many major camps, Zionists and those they have convinced through incessant propaganda still repeat the erroneous six million number as fact.

Jewish scholar Norman Finkelstein outlined Zionist deceptions vis-à-vis the orthodox holocaust narrative in his book *The Holocaust Industry*.^[53] Finkelstein observes that a dogma has been fashioned around the “holocaust” by the Jewish-Zionist establishment as a means of thought control. Shielding Israel from criticism and rebuke, Finkelstein argues, is a primary motivation behind the ceaseless promotion of holocaust mythology, in addition to Zionist shakedowns for reparations money from Germany. This profitable industry is bolstered by the Hollywood entertainment establishment which is “totally run by Jews” according to the Jewish *Los Angeles Times* columnist Joel Stein.^[54] Not only does the holocaust dogma provide Zionist Jews with psychological cover to commit heinous crimes against the Palestinians and mask them under a façade of victimhood, but it also acts as a perpetual pretext for wars that serve Israel’s interests, such as the war in Iraq.

Gilad Sharon, the son of Israeli war criminal politician Ariel Sharon, vividly unveiled the bloodthirsty and bellicose nature of Zionism in a 2012 op-ed for the *Jerusalem Post*. Calling openly for the genocidal carpet-bombing of Gaza, Sharon declared: “We need to flatten entire neighborhoods in Gaza. Flatten all of Gaza. The Americans didn’t stop with Hiroshima – the Japanese weren’t surrendering fast enough, so they hit Nagasaki, too.”^[55] Sharon’s remarks are not the ravings of a fringe lunatic – they are completely consistent with the teachings of the pioneers of Zionist ideology, like Dr. David Wolffsohn, the late World Zionist Organization chairman, who told a meeting of Zionists in 1907 that Jews must put aside their differences and unite to “conquer the world.”^[56] Vladimir Jabotinsky, the father of the Revisionist strain of Zionism, said candidly, “We want a Jewish Empire.”^[57] Zionism is a “death-crazed narcissistic cult,” said Rich Siegel, a former Zionist who saw the light.^[58] The inhuman precepts of the Jewish supremacist mentality that is so prevalent in Israel today can only result in more violence and bloodshed, more misery and suffering for the Palestinians and Arabs in general.

While the West bears much shame and responsibility for aiding and abetting the Zionist project and all of its murderous and destructive consequences, bringing history into accordance with the facts is one way to uplift the Palestinians whose struggle for freedom and justice goes on.

Copyright 2014 Brandon Martinez

End Notes

[1] <http://www.justforeignpolicy.org/iraq>

[2] Stephen Green, “Serving Two Flags: Neo-Cons, Israel and the Bush Administration,” Counterpunch, Feb. 28-Mar. 02, 2004. <http://www.counterpunch.org/2004/02/28/neo-cons-israel-and-the-bush-administration/>

[3] http://www.historycommons.org/entity.jsp?entity=soltam_ltd.

[4] Bill Keller, “The Sunshine Warrior (Paul Wolfowitz),” The New York Times Magazine, Sept. 22, 2002.

<http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/news/754534/posts>

[5] Eric Schmitt, “The Busy Life of Being a Lightning Rod for Bush,” New York Times, April 22, 2002.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2002/04/22/world/the-busy-life-of-being-a-lightning-rod-for-bush.html>

[6] Zionist Organization of America News Release, Oct. 13, 1997. <http://web.archive.org/web/20010329165718/http://www.zoa.org/pressrel/19971013a.htm>

[7] Jeffrey Goldberg, “A LITTLE LEARNING: What Douglas Feith knew, and when he knew it,” The New Yorker, May 9, 2005.

http://web.archive.org/web/20060319111108/http://www.newyorker.com/printables/fact/050509fa_fact

[8] Julian Borger, "The spies who pushed for war," The Guardian, July 17, 2003.
<http://web.archive.org/web/20100329074314/http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2003/jul/17/iraq.usa>

[9] <http://www.iaps.org/strat1.htm>

[10] Stephen J. Sniegoski, "The war on Iraq: Conceived in Israel," 2003.
http://www.thornwalker.com/ditch/conc_toc.htm

[11] BBC video documentary "The War Party":
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jilA-ZeBUI4>

[12] Gal Beckerman, "The Neoconservative Persuasion Examining the Jewish roots of an intellectual movement," The Forward, Jan. 6, 2006.
<https://web.archive.org/web/20120304145938/http://galbeckerman.com/crit9/>

[13] Ari Shavit, "White man's burden," Haaretz, April 3, 2003.
<http://web.archive.org/web/20110119065714/http://www.haaretz.com/news/features/white-man-s-burden-1.14110>

[14] "Journalist Carl Bernstein Tells Joe Scarborough: 'Jewish Neocons' Responsible in Part for Iraq War," The Blaze, April 26, 2013.
<http://www.theblaze.com/stories/2013/04/26/journalist-carl-bernstein-tells-joe-scarborough-jewish-neocons-responsible-in-part-for-iraq-war/>

[15] See note 10.

[16] See note 6.

[17] See note 4.

[18] Michael Ledeen, "The New Holocaust," PJ Media, Dec. 22, 2010.
<http://pjmedia.com/michaelledeen/2010/12/22/the-new-holocaust/>

[19] "Mossad major player in Kennedy killing," Press TV, Nov. 25, 2013.
<http://www.presstv.ir/detail/2013/11/25/336583/mossad-major-player-in-kennedy-killing/>

[20] Transcript of Sept. 10, 1941, letter from Chaim Weizmann to Winston Churchill:
http://www.fpp.co.uk/History/Churchill/Weizmann_Zionists/WSC_100941.html

[21] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Balfour_Declaration

[22] Transcript of Benjamin Freedman's 1961 speech at the Willard Hotel in Washington, D.C.:
<http://www.sweetliberty.org/issues/israel/freedman.htm>

[23] Jüdische Rundschau (Jewish Review), Jan. 16, 1920.
<http://winstonsmithministryoftruth.blogspot.com/2013/03/international-jewry-is-power-after-all.html>

[24] Zionism and Palestine Before the Mandate: A Phase of Western Imperialism; an Essay with a Selection of Readings by Richard P. Stevens, Institute for Palestine Studies, 1972, p. 132.
<http://winstonsmithministryoftruth.blogspot.com/2011/04/in-1903-zionists-knew-the-reality-be-world.html>

[25] "Says Jews Will Back League," New York Times, Aug. 28, 1922.
<http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive-free/pdf?res=F40D13FF3B5D1A7A93CAAB1783D85F468285F9>

[26] Mark Weber, "Zionism and the Third Reich," The Journal of Historical Review, July-August 1993 (Vol. 13, No. 4), pages 29-37.
http://www.ihr.org/jhr/v13/v13n4p29_Weber.html

[27] The Complete Diaries of Theodor Herzl, edited by Raphael Patai, translated by Harry Zohn (1960) New York; Herzl Press, pp. 83, 84, 143.
<http://winstonsmithministryoftruth.blogspot.com/2011/12/another-amazing-zionist-prediction.html?zx=7cb290fb199a3d45>

[28] "The Zionist Plan for the Final Solution of the Jewish Question," Winston Smith Ministry of Truth, Feb. 4, 2011.
<http://winstonsmithministryoftruth.blogspot.com/2011/02/final-solution-of-jewish-question.html>

[29] Ibid.

[30] Ben Hecht, *Peridy*, p. 254. A facsimile of this page is here:
<http://winstonsmithministryoftruth.blogspot.com/2011/04/zionist-aim-to-drive-jews-from-europe.html>

[31] Ibid.

[32] The Daily Express (London), March 24, 1933, pp. 1-2. A facsimile of the front page of the paper and full text of the relevant article is here:
<http://www.biblestudysite.com/judeawar.htm>

[33] Jacques Benoist-Mechin, *Histoire de l'Armée Allemande*, Vol. IV, p. 303.
<http://guardian.150m.com/jews/jews-declare-war.htm>

[34] "Jews To Fight for Democracies: Dr. Weizmann's Letter to Mr. Chamberlain," The Times (London), Sept. 6, 1939. A facsimile of the article is available here:
<http://oi44.tinypic.com/ege6v6.jpg>

[35] David Irving, Hitler and Holocaust Denial: Electronic Edition, by Richard J. Evans.
<http://www.hdot.org/en/trial/defense/evans/540d/view/print.html>

[36] Kaufman, Theodore N. *Germany Must Perish!* Newark, NJ: Argyle, 1941.
<https://archive.org/details/GermanyMustPerish>

[37] "ZIONISTS' MASS MEETING," New York Times, June 11, 1900.
<http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archivefree/pdf?res=9E01E7D61F3CE433A25752C1A9609C946197D6CF>

[38] "Dr. Paul Nathan's View of Russian Massacre," New York Times, March 25, 1906.
<http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archivefree/pdf?res=9A00E7DE113EE733A25756C2A9659C946797D6CF>

[39] "Max Nordau's 'six million Jews' in 1899, 1911, & 1920," Winston Smith Ministry of Truth, Dec. 21, 2013.
<http://winstonsmithministryoftruth.blogspot.com/2013/12/max-nordaus-six-million-jews-in-1899.html?zx=549ada2e31178ae1>

[40] Ben Hecht, *Peridy*, p. 254.
<http://winstonsmithministryoftruth.blogspot.ca/2011/03/1911-zionist-warns-6000000-jewstobe.html?zx=f8a947be628aa7b>

[41] Hedesheimer, Don. *The First Holocaust: Jewish Fund Raising Campaigns with Holocaust Claims during and after World War One*. Chicago, IL: Theses & Dissertations, 2003.
<http://vho.org/GB/Books/tfh/>

[42] Martin H. Glynn, "The Crucifixion of Jews Must Stop," The American Hebrew, Oct. 31, 1919. A facsimile of the article is reproduced here:
<http://jrbooksonline.com/HTMLdocs/The%20Crucifixion%20of%20Jews%20Must%20Stop.htm>

[43] "Ukrainian Jews Aim To Stop Pogroms," New York Times, Sept. 8, 1919.
<http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archivefree/pdf?res=F40A11FF3E5E157A93CAA1782D85F4D8185F9>

[44] "Begs America Save 6,000,000 In Russia," New York Times, July 20, 1921.
<http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive-free/pdf?res=F60A12FA3C551A738DDDA90A94DF405B818EF1D3>

[45] Weizmann's statement was quoted in the Israeli Government Year Book (1953) and *The Jewish Western Bulletin* (Dec. 11, 1936). Facsimiles of both clippings are reproduced here:
<http://winstonsmithministryoftruth.blogspot.com/2011/02/600000-figure-of-jews-from-1936.html>

[46] "Doom of European Jews is Seen if Hitler Wins," The Palm Beach Post, June 25, 1940. Other articles mentioning Goldmann's prediction can be found here:
<http://winstonsmithministryoftruth.blogspot.com/2013/12/nahum-goldmann-soothsaying-six.html>

[47] The Pittsburgh Press, Nov. 28, 1944, p.5 / The Palestine Post, Nov. 28, 1944. Facsimiles of these articles can be found here:
<http://winstonsmithministryoftruth.blogspot.com/2011/05/nov-1944-six-million-jews-listed.html>

[48] "Wolves they were—wolves they remain," Soviet News Weekly (London), March 15, 1945. A facsimile of this and other articles where Ehrenburg invokes the six million number prior to the end of the war can be found here:
<http://winstonsmithministryoftruth.blogspot.com/2012/11/ehrenburg-6000000-jews-collection.html>

[49] Hedesheimer 2003, preface.

[50] Historian David Irving produced excerpts of Thomas Dodd's letter on his website:
http://www.fpp.co.uk/History/Nuremberg/Thomas_Dodd_Itr.html

[51] Mark Weber, "New 'Official' Changes in the Auschwitz Story," Institute of Historical Review.
http://www.ihr.org/jhr/v21/v21n3p24_weber.html

[52] The revised official death totals of Jews at Mauthausen and Majdanek are 14,000 and 60,000 respectively. See <http://winstonsmithministryoftruth.blogspot.com/2013/01/017-million-jews-killed-at-majdanek-says.html> and here: <http://www.ushmm.org/wlc/en/article.php?ModuleId=10005196>

[53] Finkelstein, Norman G. *The Holocaust Industry: Reflections on the Exploitation of Jewish Suffering*. London: VERSO, 2000.

[54] Joel Stein, "Who runs Hollywood? C'mon," Los Angeles Times, Dec. 19, 2008.
<https://web.archive.org/web/20130316201104/http://articles.latimes.com/2008/dec/19/opinion/oe-stein19>

[55] Gilad Sharon, "A decisive conclusion is necessary," The Jerusalem Post, Nov. 18, 2012.

<https://web.archive.org/web/20130318130846/http://www.ipost.com/Opinion/Op-Ed-Contributors/A-decisive-conclusion-is-necessary>

[56] "Says Jews Must Conquer. Dr. Wolffsohn Delivers Closing Speech at Zionist Congress." New York Times, Aug. 22, 1907. <http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive-free/pdf?res=FB0D16FD3C5A15738DDDA0A94D0405B878CF1D3>

[57] Brenner, Lenni. *Zionism in the Age of the Dictators*. London: Croom Helm, 1983, ch. 10.

<http://www.vho.org/aaargh/engl/zad/zad10.html>

[58] "Words from an Honest, Intelligent & Compassionate Jew – Rich Siegel," Ken O'Keefe Blog, Nov. 18, 2012.
<http://kenokeefe.wordpress.com/2012/11/15/words-from-an-honest-intelligent-compassionate-jew-rich-siegel/>

<http://www.presstv.ir/detail/2014/04/03/356982/zionist-deceit-and-world-wars/>



Brandon Martinez

Commentator

Bio

Brandon Martinez is a freelance writer and journalist from Canada whose area of expertise is foreign policy, international affairs and 20th and 21st century history. His writing is focused on issues such as Zionism, Israel-Palestine, American and Canadian foreign policy, war, terrorism and deception in media and politics. Readers can contact him at martinezperspective@hotmail.com.

[More articles on PRESSTV by Brandon Martinez](#),

<http://martinezperspective.wordpress.com/2014/04/03/a-century-of-deceit-iraq-the-world-wars-holocaust-mythology-and-zionist-militarism/>

Remove Section 18C – normalise Holocaust denial...writes Andre Oboler

By Andre Oboler, April 4, 2014

The Online Hate Prevention Institute (OHPI), the national harm prevention charity dedicated to online hate issues, has warned that proposed [changes to the Racial Discrimination Act](#) will have the effect of normalising [Holocaust denial](#), racist [Aboriginal memes](#) and [more](#) in social media.



Dr Andre Oboler

The charity's CEO, Dr Andre Oboler, today highlighted the important role of the Racial Discrimination Act, and in particular Section 18C, in getting racist content removed from social media sites. He explained that, "major social media companies will remove content, or block Australian access to it, if it can be shown that the content is likely to be unlawful in Australia." He added that getting to that stage often involved mediation by the Australian Human Rights Commission which was only possible because of Section 18C of the Racial Discrimination Act.

Last night the Online Hate Prevention Institute released a [briefing paper](#) exposing a new Holocaust denial page on Facebook. The page has been visible to Australians despite being unlawful under the existing Racial Discrimination Act. After OHPI's report exonerated the matter, after lunch today the page temporarily went down (globally) as Facebook reviewed it. Reports about the content have been rejected within mere seconds over the past few days and are still saying the page conforms to Facebook's community standards. Facebook

rejects the idea that Holocaust denial should be prohibited, saying instead that they "recognize people's right to be factually wrong about historical events".

"Without the protection of the law, in this case providing through the Racial Discrimination Act in its current form, there would be no way to ensure the values of the Australian community are reflected in social media platforms," Dr Oboler explained. Dr Oboler warned that the proposed changes to the law would "dramatically reduce the scope of protection, which in turn means more of the harmful content would remain online." Reflecting on point 4 of the law proposed by the Attorney-General, Dr Oboler described it as "unbelievably naive and clearly not written with the internet in mind".

The proposed law, like the existing law, only applies to public communication. Point 4 of the new law, however, exempts "public discussion". Dr Oboler explained that, "this has the effect of nullifying the rest of the law when it comes to online content. Under the proposal all forms of online racism, including the Holocaust denial shown in our new report, would become lawful." He added that, "Social media platforms can, and do, filter content by country. Internet filters don't work, but filtering by social media companies is an entirely different story, it is not only effective but necessary".

With the power of social media behind it, [antisemitism](#), [Aboriginal Memes](#) and other forms of racist hate speech will be able to go viral. "If the blocks put in place under the existing law are suddenly removed, we could see a tsunami of racism unleashed on the Australian public if the law is changed. The impact of this on the health of the community should not be underestimated. [Cyber-racism](#) can lead to suicide, self-harm and substance abuse. The Government should think about this a little more carefully before putting the health of the community at risk."

Oboler told J-Wire: "The Holocaust page has been temporarily taken down for review by Facebook. We expect it will be back up soon."

<http://www.jwire.com.au/featured-articles/remove-section-18c-normalise-holocaust-denial-writes-andre-oboler/41770>

Jewish groups excoriate Denmark over legalized bestiality

By SAM SOKOL, 04/03/2014 18:28

Ritual slaughter currently banned due to concerns for animal rights; PETA tells 'post' shechita one of "least humane methods of slaughter."



Giraffe killed at Copenhagen Zoo Photo: REUTERS

Several Jewish groups issued statements this week slamming Denmark for last month's [ban on Jewish ritual slaughter](#) on the grounds of animal rights, despite the country continuing to sanction bestiality.

Denmark is one of several European countries in which sexual intercourse with animals is permitted by law. The country's legalized bestiality has even attracted sex tourists from Norway, the Norwegian *Afterposten* newspaper reported in 2011.

Related:

[European Rabbis call Danish shechita ban cover for terrible animal rights record](#)

Agriculture and Food Minister Dan Jørgensen banned all slaughter without pre-stunning last month.

Importation of kosher and halal meat is still legal.

Jørgensen was quoted by local media as hanging his decision on the argument that "animal rights come before religion," a statement he later disavowed during a meeting with Jewish and Muslim communal leaders.

Denmark's legalized bestiality, however, puts the argument that the ban was engineered to protect animals into doubt, several leading European rabbis argue. Jewish organizations have doubted Denmark's animal rights record in the past, with the Conference of European Rabbis recently issuing a statement calling the ban "a fig leaf intended to cover the country's woeful record on animal welfare."

In the statement, CER President Rabbi Pinchas Goldschmidt referred to the recent outrage surrounding the killing of a healthy giraffe and four lions at a Copenhagen zoo. He

asserted that "as the media continue to report stories about perfectly healthy animals being slaughtered for no good reason, it becomes ever more apparent that this is less about animal welfare and much more about the politics of immigration and integration."

According to Ben Williamson of PETA UK, an animal rights organization in Britain, "Denmark is one of the few remaining NATO countries that still mutilates and kills live animals during medical training exercises."

Williamson did, however, commend Denmark for its ban on shechita, which he termed one of the "least humane methods of slaughter."

In a statement to *The Jerusalem Post* on Thursday, Goldschmidt, whose great-grandfather served as the Denmark's chief rabbi, called the country's legalized bestiality "another example which clearly shows that the issue at hand is not the rights of animals but a society set to limit the religious freedom of minority religions at its midst."

Denmark, he accused, can no longer lay claim to its past legacy of "tolerance and acceptance towards religious minorities."

Rabbi Menachem Margolin, president of the Rabbinical Center of Europe, another continental rabbinical organization, said that the dichotomy between allowing sex with animals who cannot give consent and disallowing ancient religious traditions calls into question the sincerity of those who say that the ban is not anti-semitic.

Those supporting the ban are hypocrites, he added.

"As long as hunting and bestiality are allowed in Denmark, the ban against shechita is populist at best," Rabbi Yitzchok Loewenthal of Chabad of Denmark remarked.

Rabbi Marc Schneier of the New-York based Foundation for Ethnic Understanding, whose European representatives recently met with Jørgensen, called the ban "pathetic," stating that a country that "legalizes animal brothels" and lacks "humane factory-farming standards" cannot claim the moral authority to ban shechita.

"This ban is nothing more than a political stunt to appease a growing far-right faction in Denmark," he said.

"Denmark was one of the countries that pressured Israel not to move forward on even more stringent legislation regarding sale of furs in our country. How can one lobby for the production and sale of fur and claim to be protecting animals with anti-shechita legislation," asked MK Dov Lipman. "It is purely about religious practice."

The Danish Agriculture Ministry did not respond to an email request for comment.

<http://www.jpost.com/JewishWorld/JewishNews/Jewish-groups-excoriate-Denmark-overlegalized-bestiality-347467>

Being and Naziness The authentic Heidegger

BY LEE SMITH, APR 14, 2014, VOL. 19, NO. 29

The literary and intellectual world was up in arms last week with the publication in Germany of Martin Heidegger's private philosophical notebooks. The first three volumes of the diaries, from the years 1931-1941, bring conclusive evidence that the man who is arguably the greatest philosopher of the 20th century was an anti-Semite.

"World Jewry," Heidegger wrote in one 1941 entry while Hitler's armies were well on their way to overrunning Europe, "is ungraspable everywhere and doesn't need to get involved in military action while continuing to unfurl its influence,

whereas we are left to sacrifice the best blood of the best of our people." In another passage, Heidegger wrote that the Jews, with their "talent for calculation," were opposed to the Nazis' racial theories because "they themselves have lived according to the race principle for longest."

In spite of all the media attention—not only in Europe, where Heidegger's influence is still felt strongly in philosophy departments, but also in the United States and Israel—the publication of the "black books," so-called because of the color of the oil-cloth covers of the diaries, hardly amounts to a

revelation. Heidegger's pro-Nazi, pro-Hitler positions have been known for more than 80 years to anyone who cared to pay attention. He joined the Nazi party in 1933, and in a 1935 lecture notoriously spoke of the "inner truth and greatness" of national socialism, a passage he saw fit to include in a collection of his work published in 1953. Heidegger never resigned his party membership during the war, and after it never publicly repudiated his pro-Nazi statements.

The question then is not whether Heidegger was a Nazi sympathizer, or an anti-Semite, for he was clearly both. As the public response to the publication of the "black books" makes clear, the question is how Heidegger's ethical and political positions should affect, if at all, our understanding of him as one of modernity's great thinkers.

This isn't the first time that Heidegger disciples and defenders have struggled with critics over the philosopher's vicious political history. In 1987, the French scholar Victor Farias published *Heidegger et le nazisme*, which split the intellectual world on both sides of the Atlantic between those who believed that his Nazism could not help but color his work and those, like Jacques Derrida, who drew a clear distinction between the philosophy and the politics.

At the time, another French philosopher, Vincent Descombes, cautioned against making too quick a judgment in either direction. Descombes, who was sharply critical of the German thinker's philosophy, observed that "it may well be that those readers who claim to have no difficulty making the transition from Heideggerian metaphysics to politics are really only too happy to find themselves on more familiar ground." In other words, Descombes was warning against the easy moves afforded by what Hoover Institution scholar and *Weekly Standard* contributor Peter Berkowitz has called "tabloid scholarship."

Berkowitz coined the phrase in 2004 while reviewing a sensationalist and mendacious book by Anne Norton, *Leo Strauss and the Politics of American Empire*. It may be difficult now, a decade later, to recall some of the outrageous claims being made back then regarding Strauss's sinister hold on figures working in the George W. Bush administration, or for instance, that journalists from prestige publications, like the *New Yorker*'s Seymour Hersh, thought the seeds of the Iraq war had been planted decades before in Strauss's seminars on the history of political philosophy at the University of Chicago. And the fact that Bush had taken the country to war to rid Saddam Hussein of his weapons of mass destruction, weapons that would never be found—well, this was a calculated executive branch deception plotted precisely along the lines of Plato's concept (supposedly endorsed by Strauss for use in practical politics) of the "noble lie." The problem was that this was a fanciful, indeed fallacious, reading of Strauss. Far from being, as many of his critics claimed, an antiliberal, Strauss, as Berkowitz wrote elsewhere, "found liberal democracy superior to all its realistic rivals." His complicated philosophical judgments were consistent with and even supported a practical preference for liberal, constitutional democracy.

Consider, in contrast, one of Heidegger's notorious statements, in which he compared industrialized agriculture to the Holocaust. "Agriculture is now a motorized food industry," Heidegger said in 1949, "the same thing in its essence as the production of corpses in the gas chambers and the extermination camps, the same thing as blockades and the reduction of countries to famine, the same thing as the manufacture of hydrogen bombs." Heidegger's philosophy apparently led to an incapacity or unwillingness to distinguish the mechanized slaughter of six million Jews from the mechanized harvesting of industrial amounts of food. Heidegger's philosophy seems to provide no sound basis for distinguishing, as Strauss does, between good regimes and bad ones. And indeed Heidegger saw no difference between Nazism, communism, and what he called Americanism—all of them, from his point of view, were virtually identical forms of nihilism.

Still, Strauss himself thought that Heidegger was perhaps the most important philosopher of the 20th century and a great reader and teacher of philosophical texts—texts that Heidegger taught his students to read as living sources of wisdom.

For Heidegger, to do philosophy is to ask the question, what is Being? Or, why is there something rather than nothing? From his point of view, philosophy took a wrong turn with Plato, who was not merely content to ask the question but attempted an answer, too. For Plato, according to Heidegger's interpretation, Being is the immutable and eternal presence. This, argues Heidegger, is where metaphysics goes astray, leading Western civilization down a rabbit hole and away from Being, from authenticity. That there is no ground for Plato's answer, no way to discern such a presence and thus the immutable truth, leads finally to nihilism, or the view, in Nietzsche's words, that nothing is true and everything is permitted. But Heidegger seems to have thought that nihilism opened up a new horizon, once again offering man the opportunity to ask again authentically, what is Being? Heidegger's attack on the Socratic philosophical tradition that led man down the wrong path seemed to open the possibility of a necessary and radical restructuring of Western civilization.

Here Heidegger was little different from many of his 20th-century peers in literature and the arts, like the poet Ezra Pound, a supporter of Mussolini who wrote that Western civilization was "an old bitch gone in the teeth." The problem with modernity as they saw it was that it was nothing but a great leveling. The lawmakers, poets, and artists that any sane society would beg to rule over it were pushed aside in favor of the mobs. To the aristocrats of spirit like Heidegger, liberal democracy was aesthetically offensive and fundamentally corrupt. The only solution was to bring it down and start again, with the philosophers and poets in charge. Thus, for close to a century now, some of the West's greatest minds have taught that the privilege, and duty, of the Western intellectual is to unmask and unmake the West, even—or especially—through violence.

For Heidegger the necessary agent of apocalypse and rebirth was the Nazis. For one of his French apostles it was Iran's Islamic Revolution. "Industrial capitalism," said Michel Foucault, had emerged as "the harshest, most savage, most selfish, most dishonest, oppressive society one could possibly imagine." It leveled the playing field with the result that everyone was mediocre. It stripped the world of its primordial magic. The authentic life was to be found in the charisma of the great leader and his stark displays of power, the superman who transcended liberal democratic values.

In 1978 Foucault went to Tehran to cover the revolution for an Italian newspaper. "It is perhaps the first great insurrection against global systems," wrote Foucault, who was later disappointed by the Iranian Revolution—as Heidegger eventually was disenchanted with Nazism. But what he found in the bright blood spilled in the streets of Tehran was a fulfillment of the orgiastic violence his work seemed to anticipate and celebrate.

The Heidegger debate matters because even 80 years after the German philosopher announced his political affiliation, and 70 years after the concentration camps were liberated, generations of Western Europeans and Americans, much of our cultural elite, have been shaped by an intellectual current that despises liberalism and dismisses as mediocre a politics based on individual freedom and committed to equality before the law. Instead, the Heideggerian spirit welcomes the return of magic, of blood and power, the violence of the strongman. In the end, the Heidegger debate is not about his thought as a philosopher but about his message as a false prophet, one who heralded the end of the liberal democratic order and the birth of something new, something terrible, something unknown.

Lee Smith is a senior editor at The Weekly Standard.
http://www.weeklystandard.com/articles/being-and-naziness_786506.html